



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/157,697	09/21/1998	RAJEEV BYRISETTY	777.180US1	2801

23460 7590 04/11/2002

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

KANG, PAUL H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/157,697

Applicant(s)

BYRISETTY ET AL.

Examiner

Paul H Kang

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2152

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 10, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson et al., US Pat. No. 5,907,324 in view of DeSimone et al., US Pat. No. 6,138,144.

3. As to claims 1, 10, 20 and 25, Larson teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Larson teaches a server maintaining a conference and various profiles of the conferences. These profiles may be retrieved by clients on the network (Larson, col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 67).

However, Larson does not explicitly teach two servers, one for maintaining a conference and a second type to maintain a list of conferences. In the same field of endeavor, DeSimone teaches maintaining a first type of servers disposed to manage data of a first type and a second type storing a list of the first type (DeSimone, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 21 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 6, line 57). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated multiple conference tracking as taught by DeSimone into the conferencing system of Larson for the purpose of enhancing network efficiency.

4. Claims 2-4, 7, 15, 17, 21, 22, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-DeSimone in view of Chu et al., US Pat. No. 6,006,331.

Art Unit: 2152

5. As to claims 4, Larson-DeSimone teach the invention substantially as claimed. However, Larson-DeSimone does not explicitly teach the use of an internet locator service (ILS) type of server. In the same field of endeavor, Chu teaches the use of an ILS server (^{Chu}DeSimone, col. 7, line 36 – col. 8, line 60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the ILS server as taught by Chu into the system of Larson-DeSimone for the purpose of enhancing system efficiency by implementing a dynamic directory structure.

6. As to claims 2, 3, 7, 15, 17, 21, 22, 26 and 27, Larson-DeSimone-Chu teach maintaining a user list through use of conference objects having addresses and connection status (Larson, col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 67 and DeSimone, col. 4, line 65 – col. 6, line 57).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-DeSimone-Chu in view of Lister et al., US Pat. No. 6,167,446.

8. As to claim 5, Larson-DeSimone-Chu teach the invention substantially as claimed. However, Larson-DeSimone-Chu does not explicitly teach the use of a NT Directory Server (NTDS). In the same field of endeavor, Lister teaches the use of an NTDS (Lister, col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the NTDS as taught by Lister into the system of Larson-DeSimone-Chu for the purpose of implementing a widely known and used server into the

Art Unit: 2152

network.

9. Claims 6, 8, 9, ~~11~~^{CANCELLED}, 14, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister in view of Kumar, US Pat. No. 6,163,531.

10. As to claim 9, Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister teach the invention substantially as claimed. However, Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister does not explicitly teach the use of Session Description Protocol (SDP). In the same field of endeavor, Kumar teaches the implementation of SDP in a distributed conferencing system (Kumar, col. 5, line 26 – col. 6, line 67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the SDP as taught by Kumar into the conferencing system of Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister for the purpose of efficient management of conferencing properties and information.

11. As to claim 19, Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister-Kumar discloses the use of ILS and NTDS (DeSimone, col. 7, line 36 – col. 8, line 60 and Lister, col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 23)

12. As to claims 6, 8, 23, 24 and 28, Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister-Kumar teaches security features for authenticating users (DeSimone, col. 7, line 13-49).

13. As to claims 11-14, 16 and 18, Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister-Kumar teaches setting up a conference, determining participation of conference, querying and updating conference profiles

Art Unit: 2152

(DeSimone, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 21 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 6, line 57).

14. As to claim 29, Larson-DeSimone-Chu-Lister-Kumar teach a system wherein data of the first type is dynamic and second type is static (DeSimone, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 21 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 6, line 57).

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicant argued in substance that the prior art of record does not teach a first server and a second server as claimed. The new grounds of rejection teaches this feature.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2152

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul H Kang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6123. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hour flex. First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (703) 305-4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-9731 for regular communications and (703) 305-3900 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Paul H Kang
Examiner
Art Unit 2152

April 8, 2002


MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100